

Washington State Auditor's Office

Special Education Program Audit

Audit Services

Report No. 58031

**CENTRALIA SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 401 AND
CHEHALIS SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 302
DBA CENTRALIA/CHEHALIS SPECIAL
EDUCATION COOPERATIVE**

Lewis County, Washington

September 1, 1995 Through August 31, 1996

January 31, 1997

I am pleased to report the results of our program audit of Centralia/Chehalis Special Education Cooperative Special Education Program covering the period September 1, 1995, through August 31, 1996. This report was prepared under the authority granted by Chapter 283, Laws of 1996.

Our audit gives an independent, accurate assessment of the condition of the program during the period we reviewed. I hope it is used as a constructive management tool to help the school districts improve their operations and to help the Legislature and others in policy decisions on special education funding.

Sincerely,

Brian Sonntag
State Auditor

Copies transmitted to:

Ronald J. Brumbaugh, President of the Board, Centralia School District
Walt Fetchner, President of the Board, Chehalis School District
Bruce L. Blaine, Superintendent, Centralia School District
Dr. Greg Kirsch, Superintendent, Chehalis School District
David R. Bagby, Special Education Director
Barbara Thomas, Business Manager, Centralia School District
Patt Anderson, Business Manager, Chehalis School District
Educational Service District No. 113
Marcelyn A. Senger, School Business Services-Supervisor of Audit Management and
Resolution, Superintendent of Public Instruction
Safety Net Committee
Jim West, Chair, Senate Ways and Means Committee
Tom Huff, Chair, House Appropriations Committee
Cheryle Broom, Legislative Auditor, Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee
Edie Harding, Washington State Institute for Public Policy
Laurie Fortier, State Publication Distribution, State Library
The Honorable Christine O. Gregoire, Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General
Office of the State Auditor

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Report Summary	
Background	1
Audit Results	1
Report Detail	
Introduction	5
Background	5
Audit Scope	6
School District Description	6
Audit Results	7
Additional Information	14
Addendum	
Directory Of Officials	15

Centralia/Chehalis Special Education Cooperative Special Education Program Audit Report Summary

BACKGROUND

The State Auditor's Office was given responsibility for auditing special education programs by the Legislature. Lawmakers were concerned about special education programs that exhibit unusual rates of growth, extraordinarily high costs, or other characteristics requiring the attention of the State Special Education Safety Net Committee. The Safety Net Committee was created to oversee state and federal special education funds set aside by the Legislature to assist school districts with demonstrated financial or program needs not met through the special education funding formula.

The Centralia/Chehalis Special Education Cooperative (the Cooperative) is among approximately 30 school districts to be selected for program audit this fiscal year. The Cooperative was selected based upon the change in its special education population and its application for additional funding through the state safety net in 1995-96.

AUDIT RESULTS

Objective 1:

To determine whether the Centralia/Chehalis Special Education Cooperative effectively and efficiently provides Free and Appropriate Education (FAPE) to special education students as defined by the *Washington Administrative Code* (WAC).

Conclusions:

- In our opinion, the Cooperative provides FAPE to special education students. The services are designed to meet the needs of students with disabilities to the same extent as students without disabilities.

District Response:

No response.

■ ■ ■

Objective 2:

To evaluate the Centralia/Chehalis Special Education Cooperative system of special education internal controls that ensure compliance with state and federal special education requirements.

Conclusion:

- The Cooperative generally has adequate policies and procedures; however, they were counting students whose Individual Education Programs (IEPs) were in process but not completed. We recommend implementing procedures that ensure compliance with state and federal special education requirements with the eligibility criteria.

District Response:

The Cooperative responded that effective spring of 1996, procedures were put in place for ensuring the completion of review IEPs prior to their anniversary date. Prior to this, the Cooperative stated it was common for the state to allow a grace period for review completion. Therefore, timeliness is no longer an issue according to the Cooperative. The Cooperative requests that the statement in the conclusion “they are counting” should state “they were counting” in order to be accurate.

Additional Remarks From The Auditor:

The report was changed to reflect the Cooperative was counting students without current IEPs during the 1995-96 school year.

■ ■ ■

Objective 3:

To verify that Centralia/Chehalis Special Education Cooperative IEPs are appropriate and properly prepared.

Conclusion:

- Our review of student files indicated that 14 percent of the district IEPs examined were not updated by the required date. These students were inappropriately counted in the district’s monthly child counts. We recommend the district complete each student’s IEP before the required date and cease counting those students whose IEPs are not current on the count dates.
- We found 3 percent of the student files to be “monitoring” IEPs. These students appear to be receiving all services in the regular classroom without being provided “specially designed instruction.” Appropriate and properly prepared IEPs require

specialty designed instruction. We recommend these students receive specialty designed instruction or be exited from the special education program.

- We also noted several files did not indicate that specialty designed instruction is offered. We recommend the Cooperative ensure specialty designed instruction is documented in each IEP.

District Response:

The district stated that the practice of establishing monitoring IEPs for a maximum of one semester will be discontinued. With the exception of the monitoring IEPs, they said IEPs indicated special education designed instruction was being offered.



Objective 4:

To determine why the Centralia/Chehalis Special Education Cooperative exhibits high rates of growth, extraordinarily high costs or other characteristics that require the attention of the Safety Net Committee.

Conclusion:

- The Cooperative experienced an overall decrease in its special education population. This decrease was the result of Cooperative efforts to reduce the special education population in the Centralia and Chehalis school districts. The new special education funding formula requires districts to take steps to transition their special education population down to the 12.7 percent index. Both Cooperative districts, Centralia and Chehalis, remain above the index. However, due to the grace period provided in the new formula, both districts received funding for the total percentage of students claimed in the 1995-96 school year.
- Based on our review, it does not appear the districts are qualifying ineligible students for special education. The same Cooperative staff is qualifying students for services at both Centralia and Chehalis school districts. However, we are unable to attribute the higher special education population in Centralia to any specific demographic factors.
- The Cooperative received less special education funding under the new formula; however, it does not appear the Cooperative's ability to provide services to its special education population was severely impacted in the 1995-96 school year.

District Response:

The Cooperative responded that this conclusion appears accurate. They believe the evidence strongly indicates a link between a district's generalized level of socio-economic status and the percentage of students requiring specially designed instruction. The Cooperative is in disagreement with the conclusion "it does not appear the Cooperative's ability to provide services to the special education population was severely impacted in the 1995-96 school year." The Cooperative stated that revenue reduction to the Centralia School District has exceeded \$200,000, however, programmatic reduction has been protected due to the district's generosity in allowing the deficit to be accommodated through reduced indirect funds.

The Cooperative believes that it has attempted to comply with the assurances of the Safety Net. The state has mandated that the Cooperative's percentage transition down to 12.7 percent, and the district establish a process for accomodating this goal. Consequently, the district has restricted students eligibility through an increase in standards relative to the "in need of specially designed instruction" component. The net impact is that students who were legally eligible are not being identified as eligible and are struggling in the regular education environment. The impact on a district's ability to meet the needs of all students is therefore severely influenced.

■ ■ ■

Objective 5:

To identify elements of the Centralia/Chehalis Special Education Program Cooperative that could be considered for implementation at other school districts.

Conclusion:

- The Cooperative is committed to meeting the needs of its students. It is evident from staff interviews that cooperation exists between general and special education staffs.

District Response:

No response.

■ ■ ■

The basis for our conclusions and the district's full response is included in the Report Detail section.

Centralia/Chehalis Special Education Cooperative Special Education Program Audit Report Detail

INTRODUCTION

This report contains the results of a program audit we performed on the Centralia/Chehalis Special Education Cooperative. Our audit covered the 1995-96 school year. The field work was completed on October 31, 1996.

BACKGROUND

In 1995, the Legislature revised the state special education funding formula (Chapter 18, 2nd Special Session, Laws of 1995). The formula incorporates three significant changes: (1) the move to an “excess cost” funding model which includes only the costs of a child’s special education above basic education funding, (2) establishment of a maximum index of eligible special education enrollment per district, and (3) a single allocation of funds per student without regard to a student’s disability.

The Legislature set aside nearly \$40 million in state and federal funds to assist school districts with demonstrated financial or program needs not met through the funding formula. This “safety net” was required due to a 1987 court decision in the case, *Washington State Special Education Coalition v. State of Washington*. The court requires the state to provide a safety net when special education funding is based upon statewide averages. A State Special Education Safety Net Committee was created to review applications for safety net funds. The State Auditor’s Office was given responsibility for auditing special education programs exhibiting unusual rates of growth, extraordinarily high costs or other characteristics requiring the attention of the Safety Net Committee.

This audit was conducted in accordance with the legislation that assigned the State Auditor’s Office responsibility for auditing special education programs. The Centralia/Chehalis Special Education Cooperative is among approximately 30 districts to be selected for program audit this fiscal year. The Centralia/Chehalis Special Education Cooperative was selected based on two factors. First, the overall decrease or change in the special education population between 1994-95 and 1995-96. The second factor was the applications submitted to the State Safety Net Committee. We selected the Centralia School District based on the above factors. However, because Centralia and Chehalis School Districts work as a Cooperative, we determined it was more efficient to audit them together.

AUDIT SCOPE

We examined student Individual Education Programs (IEPs) and other district records concerning the assessment and evaluation of students. We reviewed the special education program for efficiency and effectiveness. We also looked at records and data to determine the accuracy of statements made to the Safety Net Committee.

The methods used to perform this audit included detailed reviews of district records, staff interviews, observation of the program, and analysis of data derived from the district and other sources when appropriate. Specific methods used for the examination of each audit objective are detailed in the working papers.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DESCRIPTION

The Centralia School District and the Chehalis School District are municipal corporations organized pursuant to Title 28A *Revised Code of Washington* (RCW) for the purpose of providing public school services to students in grades K-12. There are five elected board members for each school district who have oversight responsibility for the district they serve. Each board also appoints their own district management and has fiscal responsibility for their district.

District officials who were key contacts during this audit:

- Mr. David R. Bagby, Special Education Director
- Mr. Bruce L. Blaine, Centralia School District Superintendent
- Ms. Barbara Thomas, Centralia School District Business Manager
- Dr. Greg Kirsch, Chehalis School District Superintendent
- Ms. Patt Anderson, Chehalis School District Business Manager

Centralia School District is located in Lewis County and consists of five elementary schools, one middle school and one high school. The 1995-96 district enrollment was 3,290 students, of which 538 were special education students. This special education enrollment has decreased to approximately 16.3 percent of total enrollment from the 1994-95 percentage of 18.6 percent.

Chehalis School District is also located in Lewis County and consists of three elementary schools, one middle school and one high school. The 1995-96 district enrollment was 2,562 students, of which 337 were special education students. This special education enrollment has decreased to approximately 13.16 percent of total enrollment from the 1994-95 percentage of 14.3 percent.

The Cooperative's special education population comes from both Centralia and Chehalis School Districts as well as 11 other school districts within Lewis County. Approximately 30 students were served in 1995-96 from the additional districts. The average enrollment of the Cooperative for 1995-96 was 901 students. The combined percentage for the Cooperative in 1995-96 was approximately 14.7 percent.

AUDIT RESULTS

Objective 1:

To determine whether the Centralia/Chehalis Special Education Cooperative effectively and efficiently provides a Free and Appropriate Education (FAPE) to special education students as defined by the *Washington Administrative Code* (WAC).

Conclusion:

We determined that the Centralia/Chehalis Special Education Cooperative (the Cooperative) is providing its special education population, ages three to twenty-one, with FAPE in accordance with the WAC. The program meets the standards required by the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction and includes preschool, elementary, and secondary education. Services offered conform to the IEP developed for each student.

The Cooperative has a referral and evaluation process for students who have needs that may not be met in the general education classroom. In 1994-95 the Cooperative's special education population was significantly above the 12.7 percent index contained in the new funding formula. The Cooperative risks losing funding for students served over the 12.7 percent index. For this reason, the Cooperative has begun limiting the number of referrals to special education. The Cooperative does this in two ways: (1) they closely examine each student and determine if they are "in need of special education services" or if accommodations or modifications can be made in the general education setting; and (2) general and special education staff work together to provide students with interventions and alternative means of addressing deficits before referring students to special education. Some examples of interventions utilized are Chapter I/LAP programs, behavior plans, peer-tutoring, the use of counseling, and social skills training.

The Cooperative offers special education students a continuum of services ranging from in-class services, pull-out services, self-contained classrooms and transitional programs. This continuum seeks to provide each special education student with an appropriate program designed to meet individual needs. In addition to increasing interventions and limiting referrals, Cooperative management indicated the change in the funding formula encourages them to provide more pull-out and self-contained classrooms.

District Response:

No response.

Objective 2:

To evaluate the Centralia/Chehalis Special Education Cooperative system of internal controls that ensure compliance with state and federal special education requirements.

Conclusion:

Internal controls are established to direct the special education referral process and ensure continuing compliance with special education requirements. We conducted interviews with the special education core administrative team, as well as certificated staff, speech language pathologists, occupational therapists/physical therapists, and school psychologists to document and assess the staffs' understanding and compliance with the process. Those interviews established that an internal control process is in place, appropriate personnel are assigned to oversee the process, and that special education staff know and attempt to follow the process.

We identified one area that should be strengthened. It involved the monthly report of the special education enrollment for the district (P-223H Form). The eligibility criteria for counting a student states that a student's evaluation and IEP must be current on the count date. The Cooperative counted students whose IEPs were in process but not completed. Therefore, the IEPs were not current on the count date. The Cooperative utilizes a data base to determine when IEPs and evaluations are due; however, this information was not used to adjust the P-223H count. We recommend implementing procedures to ensure compliance with the eligibility criteria.

District Response:

Your conclusion is that "they are counting students whose individual educational plans (IEPs) are in process but not completed." This was an incorrect statement. Effective in the spring of 1996, the district put into place procedures for ensuring the completion of review IEPs prior to their anniversary date. Prior to this time, it was common for the state to allow a grace period for the completion to review IEPs. This is verified by previous monitoring activities. The current auditors have indicated that overdue IEPs were no more than one or two months behind. It should be noted that in the spring of 1996, we were notified of the State's concern over this issue, and established procedures to ensure timeliness with the IEPs. Therefore, timeliness is no longer an issue. The statement in your conclusion "they are counting" should actually state "they were counting" in order to be accurate.

We believe it is important to note that during the 1995-96 school year while the anniversary date may have lapsed slightly, services continued to be provided to eligible, appropriately identified handicapped students. While the paperwork may have exceeded the one year anniversary date, the services for which we were receiving state funding continued to be provided.

Additional Remarks From The Auditor:

We changed the report to reflect the Cooperative was counting students whose IEPs were not current on the count date during the scope of our audit, the 1995-96 school year.

Objective 3:

To verify that the Centralia/Chehalis Special Education Cooperative IEPs are appropriate and properly prepared.

Conclusion:

We reviewed 100 special education files to determine if they complied with federal and state procedural requirements and directives. The files reviewed were systematically chosen. We selected the first two student files and the last two student files from each alphabet letter. If there were not at least four files for an alphabet letter, we selected all of the files for that letter. Items found out of compliance in the 100 files reviewed include:

- 14% Students counted without a current IEP
- 3% Indicated that they did not offer “specially designed instruction”

We determined that the Centralia/Chehalis Special Education Cooperative has a significant percentage of students inappropriately included on the monthly special education count. We suggest implementing an additional internal control to ensure students are not counted for months they are not eligible for special education services. We also discussed this concern as part of our review of special education internal controls in Objective 2.

We also found students with “monitoring” IEPs. This makes up the 3 percent that were not “specially designed instruction.” Students with monitoring IEPs are receiving services in the regular classroom that do not qualify as specially designed instruction. The Cooperative is using monitoring IEPs to observe the success of students before exiting them from the program. These students are counted each month but are not receiving specially designed instruction. As defined in WAC 392-172-045 and WAC 392-172-174, specially designed instruction is planned and organized instructional activities designed by certificated special education and/or related services personnel. This instruction may be implemented by other special education and/or related services personnel as provided by the IEP. The term does not include individual accommodations and modifications to the general classroom. Appropriate and properly prepared IEPs require specially designed instruction. We recommend students with monitoring IEPs either receive specially designed instruction or be exited from the special education program.

In addition to the monitoring IEPs, several files did not indicate that specially designed instruction is offered. We discussed this issue with the Special Education Director, and we are satisfied that specially designed instruction is provided to the students selected in our file review. However, we recommend the Cooperative implement internal controls to ensure that specially designed instruction is documented in each student’s IEP.

District Response:

Addressed in our response to Objective 2.

The monitoring IEPs were established for a maximum of one semester to enable a smooth transition into the regular education classroom. This practice will be discontinued.

Special education designed instruction is defined as “organized and planned instructional activities which are designed by certified special education and related personnel.” With the exception of the monitoring IEPs as addressed in the previous section, there were no IEPs that did not indicate special education design instruction was being offered. The auditing team questioned whether study skills were appropriately considered special education design instruction, but after being informed that the district is utilizing a structured Study Skills program, they agreed that it was special education designed instruction. Within the IEP were goals and objectives which were individualized and specially designed to address each student's unique needs.

Objective 4:

To determine why the Centralia/Chehalis Special Education Cooperative exhibits high rates of growth, extraordinary high costs or other characteristics that require the attention of the Safety Net Committee.

Conclusion:

Both Centralia and Chehalis School Districts had a decrease in the overall population served in special education between the 1994-95 and 1995-96 school years. Centralia School District's special education population dropped approximately 2.3 percent between the two school years while Chehalis School District's special education population fell approximately 1.2 percent. We found that the total enrollment for the two districts stayed roughly the same between 1994-95 and 1995-96. As discussed in Objective 1, this decrease was due to the Cooperative's efforts to limit special education referrals.

The overall percentage of students served in special education for the two districts differs significantly. Centralia is approximately 3.5 percent above the 12.7 percent index contained in the new formula while Chehalis has decreased its numbers to approximately 13.16 percent. Although both districts remain above 12.7 percent, each district received funding for the total percentage of students claimed in the 1995-96 school year. Districts were allowed a grace period to reduce the percentage of students served in special education as part of the change in the funding formula. Districts above the 12.7 percent index were funded for up to 75 percent of the 1994-95 enrollment percentage or the actual 1995-96 percentage, whichever was less.

Although there is a significant difference between the percentage served in each district, the same staff is qualifying students for special education services within the Cooperative. Based on our review, it does not appear the districts are qualifying ineligible students for services. The Cooperative is examining other means of serving students before placing them in special education. The use of interventions appear to have reduced the special education enrollment percentages for both districts.

According to Cooperative management, demographic conditions between the two cities explains the difference in the special education percentages. All factors discussed related directly to Centralia being a lower income community. We found that Centralia does have a

higher percentage of students receiving free and reduced meals. However, we are unable to conclude that lower income is directly responsible for a higher occurrence of special education students. We will continue to examine this in future audits.

We considered whether the Cooperative has unusually high costs not considered in the new special education funding formula. We reviewed program staff and budgets before and after the funding formula change. We noted that the state funding formula generated less special education revenue for the Cooperative in 1995-96 than the previous year. The Cooperative addressed the decrease in special education revenues by reducing special education personnel and decreasing the amount of the indirect costs paid to the Cooperative's hosting districts, Chehalis and Centralia. These reductions did not significantly impact the Cooperative's direct program services in the 1995-96 school year for two reasons. First, the Cooperative served fewer special education students in 1995-96. Second, the current Cooperative agreement requires the Cooperative to reimburse Centralia and Chehalis for indirect costs, such as the use of the district classrooms, from excess state revenue. The excess revenue is determined after direct program expenditures have been made. A significant portion of the revenue reduction was offset by the decrease in the indirect payments to Chehalis and Centralia. Although the Cooperative received less special education funding under the new formula, it appears that the Cooperative's ability to provide services to its special education population was not severely impacted in the 1995-96 school year. At this time, we cannot determine whether future reductions would compromise the Cooperative's ability to provide appropriate services to its special education population.

We reviewed three additional factors which may affect the costs or percentages related to special education. The Cooperative serves students who reside at Green Hill, a juvenile detention center located in Chehalis. The students at Green Hill are not included in either district's special education percentage and do not generate special education revenue. The Cooperative incurred but was not compensated for the cost of the Special Education Director and an itinerant staff member's time.

The Cooperative serves three students from districts within Lewis County that do not have high schools ("non-high" districts). These students are more severely disabled and result in higher costs to the Cooperative. Although they live outside either district's boundaries, the students from non-high districts are considered residents of the district they attend. The non-high students are included in the Chehalis resident special education population and count toward the district's 12.7 percent index. However, with the grace period associated with the 12.7 percent index discussed earlier, Chehalis received both the basic and special education funds these students generated for 1995-96.

The Cooperative serves students through interdistrict agreements. The resident district receives the special education allocation and the serving district receives the basic education allocation for each student. The Cooperative bills the resident district a predetermined amount for each student served. These students often attend a school within the Cooperative because there is not an adequate program available within their resident district. There are usually higher costs associated with these students. The Cooperative bills the resident district the average cost of the classroom in which the child receives services. If the student has a one-to-one aide, the amount billed to the resident district increases to reflect the educational

assistant's time. This system generates revenue to cover incremental costs associated with the specific program as well as assist with the fixed costs of the program.

We considered Green Hill, non-high districts, and interdistrict agreements during our audit. At this time, we do not believe they have a substantial impact on the Centralia/Chehalis Special Education Cooperative's program costs or percentage of students served.

District Response:

This conclusion appears accurate.

We believe the facts reveal:

- 1) The Cooperative is utilizing the same criteria to determine eligibility in both Chehalis and Centralia.*
- 2) Both districts have been verified as identifying only eligible students in need of specially designed instruction.*
- 3) Centralia has a significantly higher percentage of students eligible for special education than does Chehalis.*
- 4) The only significant causal variable that can be identified to account for this difference is socio-economic status between the districts. Centralia has a dramatically higher percentage of unemployed, low socio-economic families.*
- 5) Therefore, we believe that the evidence is strongly indicating that there is a link between a district's generalized level of socio-economic status and the percentage of students requiring specially designed instruction. Assuming this link does not exist is a fundamental flaw of the current funding formula.*

The Cooperative is in disagreement with the conclusion that "it does not appear the Cooperative's ability to provide services to the special education population was severely impacted in the 1995-96 school year." While arguably the impact of the funding formula can be predicted to severely impact our district in the next couple of years, we disagree that severe impact has not already transpired. The following is the basis of our disagreement:

- 1) Revenue reduction to the Centralia School District has exceeded \$200,000.*
- 2) Programmatic reduction has been protected due to the district's generosity in allowing the budgetary deficit to be accommodated through reduced indirect funds.*
- 3) Given the current formula we can accurately predict funding levels for the next biennium. The following chart reflects the revenue loss to the district.*

<i>SCHOOL YEAR</i>	<i>REDUCED REVENUE</i>
<i>1995-96</i>	<i>\$227,041</i>
<i>1996-97</i>	<i>\$372,772</i>

1997-98	\$518,503
1998-99	\$664,347

- 4) *It can therefore be established that the revenue reduction as a result of the formula will have a significant impact in programs beginning the 1997-98 school year.*

The Cooperative has attempted to comply with the assurances of the Safety Net. The state has mandated that the Cooperative's percentage transition down to 12.7%, and the district establish a process for accommodating this goal. Consequently, the district has restricted students eligibility through an increase in standards relative to the "in need of specially designed instruction" component. The net impact is the students who were legally eligible are not being identified as eligible and are struggling in the regular education environment. The Title I programs are therefore identifying a larger pool of eligible students who were previously receiving services are no longer able to receive them. The impact on a districts' ability to meet the needs of all students is therefore severely influenced.

Objective 5:

To identify elements of the Centralia/Chehalis Special Education Cooperative that could be considered for implementation in other school districts.

Conclusion:

The Cooperative is committed to meeting the individual needs of its students. It is evident from the staff interviews that cooperation exists between the general and special education staffs.

District Response:

No response.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

It is important to note that this audit does not take the place of, or otherwise duplicate, the regularly scheduled audit of the district which includes a review of financial statements and compliance with laws and regulations. Accordingly, we do not express any opinion related to those items in this report. We did consult with the financial auditors and brought items to their attention when warranted.

The audit of the Centralia/Chehalis Special Education Cooperative was performed in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. As such, it included such tests of records and other audit procedures we considered necessary, including a review of management controls where appropriate.

This report is a public document. To obtain additional copies of this report, or for questions related to the audit, address inquiries to the State Auditor's Office, PO Box 40021, Olympia, WA 98504-0021 or call (360) 753-4792.

Centralia School District No. 401 Special Education Program Audit Addendum

Directory Of Officials

Elected

		<u>Term</u>	<u>Expiration</u>
Board of Directors:			
Position 1	Ronald J. Brumbaugh President	4	December 1997
Position 2	Jan Leth	4	December 1999
Position 3	Robert D. Fuller	4	December 1999
Position 4	Maree Quade	4	December 1999
Position 5	John C. Nessel	4	December 1997

Appointed

Superintendent	Bruce L. Blaine
Assistant Superintendent	Dr. Douglas Kernutt
Business Manager	Barbara Thomas
Centralia/Chehalis Special Services:	
Special Education Director	David R. Bagby
Asst. Special Education Director	Vacant
Program Administrator	Dr. Peter Hendrickson
Attorney	Cliff Foster

Mailing Address

District	2320 Borst Avenue PO Box 610 Centralia WA 98531
Attorney	Vandenberg & Johnson 1900 First Interstate Plaza 1201 Pacific Tacoma WA 98402

Chehalis School District No. 302 Special Education Program Audit Addendum

Directory Of Officials

Elected

		<u>Term</u>	<u>Expiration</u>
Board of Directors:			
District 1	Christine Langford	4	December 1999
District 2	Dennis Dawes (President 1995)	4	December 1999
District 3	Mary Jane Dwight	4	December 1997
District 4	Walt Fechtner (President 1996)	4	December 1997
District 5	Greg Hill	4	December 1999

Appointed

Superintendent	Dr. Greg Kirsch (Appointed 10/1/95)
Business Manager	Patt Anderson
Centralia/Chehalis Special Services:	
Special Education Director	David R. Bagby
Asst. Special Education Director	Vacant
Attorneys:	Brian Baker Renee Remund

Mailing Address

District	310 SW 16th Chehalis WA 98532
Attorneys	Brian Baker 919 Lakeridge Way SW Olympia WA 98502 Renee Remund 345 NW Pacific Chehalis WA 98532